

The Civil War With No Ending

Exposure of Martial Law, Executive Orders,
Why The Constitution Seems To Have No Bearing...
and
A Viable Solution To Obtain "Liberty and Justice for All"

by: April Reigne
September 14, 2010

The Lieber Code copied by: April Reigne
Made publicly available by: We ROAR! www.WeRoar.ws
and
www.AgainstGovernmentCorruption.org

All Rights Reserved – All means All

ISBN: 978-0-557-69010-7

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

<u>Introduction</u> by April Reigne	page 3
Section I: Martial Law – Military Jurisdiction – Military Necessity – Retaliation.	
Articles 1-30	page 4
Section II: Public and Private Property of the Enemy – Protection of Persons, and Especially of Women, of Religion, the Arts and Sciences – Punishment of Crimes Against the Inhabitants of Hostile Countries.	
Articles 31-47	page 14
Section III: Deserters – Prisoners of War – Hostages – Booty on the battlefield.	
Articles 48-80	page 21
Section IV: Partisans – Armed Enemies Not Belonging to the Hostile Army – Scouts – Armed Prowlers – War-rebels.	
Articles 81-85	page 26
Section V: Safe-conduct – Spies – War-traitors – Captured Messengers – Abuse of the Flag of Truce.	
Articles 86-104	page 27
Section VI: Exchange of Prisoners – Flags of Truce – Flags of Protection.	
Articles 105-118	page 30
Section VII: The Parole.	
Articles 119-134	page 32
Section VIII: Armistice – Capitulation.	
Articles 135-147	page 34
Section IX: Assassination	
Article 148	page 36
Section X: Insurrection – Civil War – Rebellion	
Articles 149-157	page 37
<u>Solution</u>	page 40
<u>Treaties</u>	page 42
<u>Resources</u>	page 49
<u>Extra Documents for Research</u>	page 50

Introduction by April Reign

It has become apparent our courts are bankrupt when it comes to "Liberty and Justice for All." It is obvious the public (and private) schools are more concerned about receiving federal funding than accurately educating our children. It is heartbreaking to watch CPS do as it pleases without any recourse for their actions.

Growing up, I learned (from public school) that communism is "bad." Yet, now when I look around, all I see is a socialistic, communistic government that is intruding upon every aspect of our lives, more and more each day.

I remember saying the "Pledge of Allegiance" every morning, but never having learned what a pledge is, what allegiance is, and most certainly never heard we had a republican form of government (Constitution, Article 4 Section 4 guarantees us this), but instead I was repeatedly told, "We have a great democracy!"

I tried to find out why none of the 'freedom movements' had been able to obtain a foothold, all the while witnessing those in our government (local, state and federal) continually usurp and infringe upon our birthright / inalienable rights. During my research, I came across a few really interesting documents, one of them being the Lieber Code, which is what this book is based on.

This book is coming out in a 'rush,' because I believe this extremely important information needs to reach the public. I have done my best to keep any "fluff and filler" out of this book.

Every Article in the Lieber Code is included in its entirety. I found it was much simpler to work directly from the Lieber Code, thus why the amount of my own writing in this book is limited. I purposely made it a "short book" as to not overwhelm any who may read it.

My input is brown. I do not always have something to add-they made some of the Articles very clear and specific. Definitions given by Blacks Law Dictionary 2nd Edition 1910 is blue. I included them to avoid any possible confusion.

At the end of this book, I offer a solution. Those who are interested in taking action toward that solution, or have another idea/solution, are welcome to contact me (see the end of the book).

*Let's begin ...
before yet another inalienable right is bargained into a privilege!*

The Lieber Code of 1863

GENERAL ORDERS NO. 100

WAR DEPT., ADJT. GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, April 24, 1863.

The following "instructions for the Government of Armies of the United States in the Field," prepared by Francis Lieber, LL.D., and revised by a board of officers, of which Maj. Gen. E. A. Hitchcock is president, having been approved by the President of the United States, he commands that they be published for the information of all concerned.

By order of the Secretary of War:
E. D. TOWNSEND
Assistant Adjutant-General.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF ARMIES OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE FIELD.

SECTION I

Martial law – Military jurisdiction – Military necessity – Retaliation.

Article 1. A place, district, or country occupied by an enemy (*seceded States, States that disagree with US*) stands, in consequence of the occupation, under the martial law of the invading or occupying army (*the US*), whether any proclamation declaring martial law, or any public warning to the inhabitants, has been issued or not. Martial law is the immediate and direct effect and consequence of occupation or conquest.

The presence of a hostile army (*the US Army*) proclaims its martial law.

During the Civil War (aka Northern Aggression), DC/US armies occupied the States; all of the States regardless of "which side they were on," or if they had seceded from the union or not. To this very day, the US continues to occupy all of the States. No warning or announcement of martial law ever needs to be made. Such announcements are simply a courtesy. Martial law was, and still is, in effect. However, with the Lieber Code being published in 1863, martial law was in fact, announced. Sadly, the majority of people today have no idea what the Lieber Code even is.

We are taught to believe that the Civil War was about slavery. It was not. The States, which seceded, had a president, Davis. There were literally two nations (State unions) in place at the same time. In fact, Rhode Island, one of the 'northern States,' was a slave state. So if it wasn't about slavery, what was the Civil War about?

The southern/Confederate States believed each State was sovereign, and that the US fed govt. should not be allowed to dictate a States laws. They viewed

(correctly in my opinion) the union as a coming-together of military support to protect the borders of the States. Apparently, the US fed govt. saw the States as a means to support its insatiable appetite for power. Since that time and to now, a number of “freedom movements” have cropped up throughout the various States, proclaiming their sovereignty and proving the US fed govt. usurpation of unlawful powers.

Article 2. Martial law does not cease during the hostile occupation, except by special proclamation, ordered by the commander in chief, or by special mention in the treaty of peace concluding the war, when the occupation of a place or territory continues beyond the conclusion of peace as one of the conditions of the same.

The way to end martial law is by a proclamation ordered by the commander in chief (aka President of the United States).

Based upon my own ‘belief’ that the Civil War ended, I began searching for the “special proclamation ordered by the commander in chief” or a “special mention in the treaty of peace.” You can imagine my dismay when no such proclamation or treaty of peace between the States and the US has yet to be found!

Article 3. Martial law in a hostile country consists in the suspension by the occupying military authority of the criminal and civil law, and of the domestic administration and government in the occupied place or territory, and in the substitution of military rule and force for the same, as well as in the dictation of general laws, as far as military necessity requires this suspension, substitution, or dictation.

The Constitutions of the republics (States) have been suspended as well as the Constitution for the united States of America. However, the constitutions (of the States and uSA) have been replaced by the occupying army (US) . They got away with this by making the replacement constitutions almost identical to the organic Constitution for the united States of America and the respective State Constitutions.

Article 4. Martial law is simply military authority exercised in accordance with the laws and usages of war. Military oppression is not martial law; it is the abuse of the power which that law confers. As martial law is executed by military force, it is incumbent upon those who administer it to be strictly guided by the principles of justice, honor, and humanity – virtues adorning a soldier even more than other men, for the very reason that he possesses the power of his arms against the unarmed.

This explains why torture – in any means whatsoever – is not acceptable or allowed. The assaults that occurred during the Bush administration, along with the disclosure and charges against such military personnel for such oppression has been done, is only more evidence that we are still under the Lieber Code – or should I say martial law?

Article 5. Martial law should be less stringent in places and countries fully occupied and fairly conquered. Much greater severity may be exercised in places or regions where actual hostilities exist or are expected and must be prepared for. Its most complete sway is allowed – even in the commander's own country – when face to face with the enemy (constitutionalists, patriots, protestors, etc), because of the absolute necessities of the case, and of the paramount duty to defend the country (the US, the federal government, which was supposed to be confined to a 10 mile area known as DC) against invasion.

To save the country is paramount to all other considerations.

Where there are groups or areas of people who believe in the Constitution, inalienable rights, or disagree with the government, martial law will be more aggressively enforced.

Article 6. All civil and penal law shall continue to take its usual course in the enemy's places and territories under martial law, unless interrupted or stopped by order of the occupying military power; but all the functions of the hostile government (the States) – legislative, executive, or administrative – whether of a general, provincial, or local character, cease under martial law, or continue only with the sanction, or, if deemed necessary, the participation of the occupier or invader.

In the courts, civil and penal law have been stopped, which is evidenced by the gold fringe flags in the courts. Additionally, if it appears that our governments are working for us, it is only because their continuation of governing/operating was sanctioned or deemed necessary by the US fed govt. Obviously, the 'necessity' has lessened throughout the decades.

Article 7. Martial law extends to property, and to persons, whether they are subjects of the enemy or aliens to that government.

Our property (which is not really ours – stop paying property taxes and see if you get to keep it), our businesses, and our bodies are subject to martial law. This applies to everyone, even for those who are friendly to the US. Is it any wonder how they have been enclosing upon every aspect of our lives? Under martial law, they are able to do so, and our State/local governments are not able to protect us.

Article 8. Consuls, among American and European nations, are not diplomatic agents. Nevertheless, their offices and persons will be subjected to martial law in cases of urgent necessity only; their property and business are not exempted. Any delinquency they commit against the established military rule may be punished as in the case of any other inhabitant, and such punishment furnishes no reasonable ground for international complaint.

There is seemingly no 'safe place' for anyone to go ... martial law has expanded worldwide by claiming American and European nations in this document.

What “American nations” are they referring to? Clearly this cannot just be the States, because there are many nations in America (Canada, Mexico, Venezuela, Argentina...).

What “European nations” are they referring to?

Who really invaded the States? Perhaps a combination of the US (federal govt.) and some ‘European nation,’ such as the Crown (the sovereign city) or the Vatican (another sovereign city)?

Article 9. The functions of ambassadors, ministers, or other diplomatic agents, accredited by neutral powers to the hostile government, cease, so far as regards the displaced government; but the conquering or occupying power usually recognizes them as temporarily accredited to itself.

The functions of ambassadors, ministers, etc. are used only for the US fed govt. They no longer exist at a State capacity.

Article 10. Martial law affects chiefly the police and collection of public revenue and taxes, whether imposed by the expelled government or by the invader, and refers mainly to the support and efficiency of the Army, its safety, and the safety of its operations.

They changed our peace officers into law enforcement. They continue to collect taxes and fees regardless of whether or not they were imposed by the States, which would have been the case prior to the Civil War.

The various military branches are in place to ensure the safety of the US fed govt. only. This explains why they have repeatedly refused to protect the borders of various States.

Article 11. The law of war does not only disclaim all cruelty and bad faith concerning engagements concluded with the enemy (the States) during the war, but also the breaking of stipulations solemnly contracted by the belligerents in time of peace, and avowedly intended to remain in force in case of war between the contracting powers.

It disclaims all extortions and other transactions for individual gain; all acts of private revenge, or connivance at such acts.

Offenses to the contrary shall be severely punished, and especially so if committed by officers.

It appears that the US fed govt. is willing to subject its own officers. Again, there seems to be no “safe place” for anyone to go.

Article 12. Whenever feasible, martial law is carried out in cases of individual offenders by military courts; but sentences of death shall be executed only with the approval of the chief executive, provided the urgency of the case does not require a speedier execution, and then only with the approval of the chief commander.

More evidence of why gold fringe flags (military flags) are now found in the courtrooms.

Who exactly is the 'chief executive?' The President falls under the 'executive branch'. Is this evidence that the President is allowed to be a tyrant (do as he/she wishes) and create 'Executive Orders?' Considering Lincoln was the first president to issue an 'executive order,' and every president afterwards has done so, I believe the Lieber Code is the source of such actions taking place.

EXECUTIVE. As distinguished from the legislative and judicial departments of government the executive department is that which is charged with the detail of carrying the laws into effect and securing their due observance. The word "executive" is also used as an impersonal designation of the chief executive officer of a state or nation.

Comm. v. Hall, 9 Gray (Mass.) 267, 69 Am. Dec. 285; In re Railroad Com'rs, 15 Neb. 679, 50 N. W. 276; In re Davies, 168 N.Y. 89, 61 N.E. 118, 56 L. R.A. 855; State v. Denny, 118 Ind. 382, 21 N. E. 252, 4 L. R.A. 79.

PRESIDENT: The chief executive magistrate of a state or nation, particularly under a democratic form of government; or of a province, colony, or dependency.

-President of the United States: The official title of the chief executive officer of the federal government in the United States

Article 13. Military jurisdiction is of two kinds: First, that which is conferred and defined by statute; second, that which is derived from the common law of war. Military offenses under the statute law must be tried in the manner therein directed; but military offenses which do not come within the statute must be tried and punished under the common law of war. The character of the courts which exercise these jurisdictions depends upon the local laws of each particular country.

In the armies of the United States (the US fed govt.) the first is exercised by courts-martial; while cases which do not come within the Rules and Articles of War, or the jurisdiction conferred by statute on courts-martial, are tried by military commissions.

Now it makes sense as to why there are so many statutes. This is simply to avoid having to operate under common law (of war).

We are also able to now understand why there are gold fringe flags (military flags) in the courtrooms. It may prove helpful to obtain the "Rules and Articles of War" as well as "common law of war" documents.

Article 14. Military necessity, as understood by modern civilized nations, consists in the necessity of those measures which are indispensable for securing the ends of the war, and which are lawful according to the modern law and usages of war.

The US fed govt. militaries are lawful and are to assist in securing the end of war ... yet there has not been a treaty of peace! If the US fed govt. intention is

to not end the war, then this leads me to believe their militaries are not acting lawfully.

Article 15. Military necessity admits of all direct destruction of life or limb of armed enemies (constitutionalists, patriots, other enemy nations, etc.), and of other persons (like the children in schools and daycare centers) whose destruction is incidentally unavoidable in the armed contests of the war; it allows of the capturing of every armed enemy, and every enemy of importance to the hostile government, or of peculiar danger to the captor; it allows of all destruction of property, and obstruction of the ways and channels of traffic, travel, or communication (cell phones, internet, radio, tv, etc.), and of all withholding of sustenance or means of life from the enemy (taxes from profit and labor); of the appropriation of whatever an enemy's country affords necessary for the subsistence and safety of the Army (the enemy country/States must pay for the US fed govt. army - the States have no State armies/etc. to protect themselves), and of such deception as does not involve the breaking of good faith (they have broken the good faith of the people with their lies, burglaries, murders) either positively pledged, regarding agreements entered into during the war, or supposed by the modern law of war to exist. Men to take up arms against one another in public war do not cease on this account to be moral beings, responsible to one another and to God.

The men who fought against the other, are still responsible to one another! This means, if they followed orders to kill their neighbor, cousin, fellow countrymen, they are responsible for the death, not the US fed govt.

Article 16. Military necessity does not admit of cruelty – that is, the infliction of suffering for the sake of suffering or for revenge, nor of maiming or wounding except in fight, nor of torture to extort confessions. It does not admit of the use of poison in any way, nor of the wanton devastation of a district. They do it, just don't admit it. It admits of deception, (please show me one politician who has admitted to being deceitful) but disclaims acts of perfidy; and, in general, military necessity does not include any act of hostility which makes the return to peace unnecessarily difficult.

Since we have never had a treaty of peace to end the Civil War, I believe they have made the return to peace "unnecessarily difficult."

PERFIDY: The act of one who has engaged his faith to do a thing, and does not do it, but does the contrary.

Wolff, Inst 390.

Article 17. War is not carried on by arms alone. It is lawful to starve the hostile belligerent, armed or unarmed, so that it leads to the speedier subjection of the enemy.

It's lawful to starve the belligerent, even the unarmed belligerent! Think of all the people they could claim are belligerent!

BELLIGERENT: In international law. A term used to designate either of two nations which are actually in a state of war with each other, as well as their allies actively co-operating; as distinguished from a nation which takes no part in the war and maintains a strict indifference as between the contending parties, called a "neutral."

U.S. v The Ambrose Light (DC) 25 Fed 412; Johnson v Jones, 44 111. 151, 92 Am. Dec. 159.

Most people have no idea the Civil War has not ended, therefore we are all belligerent even if we disagree with the Presidents stance on abortion, free speech, religion, etc.

Article 18. When a commander of a besieged place expels the non-combatants, in order to lessen the number of those who consume his stock of provisions, it is lawful, though an extreme measure, to drive them back, so as to hasten on the surrender.

This goes against the Constitutions stance against those in the army (military) intruding upon our homes and taking our property (food, guns, ammo, wives, children, sheep, horses, cars, etc.)

Homes have been taken without just compensation for not paying property taxes. Children are taken from parents who home school. Cars are towed daily from people for not 'registering' their car or getting a 'drivers license.'

The US fed govt. has ~~taken~~ stolen our lands, national parks, our money (the federal reserve notes are no longer backed by gold or silver), our children, nutritious foods, clean water (is all water contaminated with fluoride?)...

Article 19. Commanders, whenever admissible, inform the enemy of their intention to bombard a place, so that the non-combatants, and especially the women and children, may be removed before the bombardment commences. **I guess they warned those in Waco Texas ... but killed the women and children anyway.** But it is no infraction of the common law of war to omit thus to inform the enemy. Surprise may be a necessity.

Article 20. Public war is a state of armed hostility between sovereign nations or governments. **Our States were (and still are) sovereign! Each State was considered as a nation, not a govt. Therefore, the people of each State/nation were sovereign as well.** It is a law and requisite of civilized existence that men live in political, continuous societies, forming organized units, called States or nations, whose constituents bear, enjoy, and suffer, advance and retrograde together, in peace and in war.

When people realize each State is in fact a nation, and that it is sovereign, they will begin to understand that they, too, are sovereign, and that they have been living under martial law. I believe upon people obtaining this knowledge, we, as a Free People, will be able to unbind ourselves as both hostages and slaves of the US fed govt., and make the commitment to keep our republic nations.

Article 21. The citizen or native of a hostile country (the people in each State) is thus an enemy, as one of the constituents of the hostile State or nation, and as such is subjected to the hardships of the war.

Article 22. Nevertheless, as civilization has advanced during the last centuries, so has likewise steadily advanced, especially in war on land, the distinction between the private individual belonging to a hostile country and the hostile country itself, with its men in arms (now I understand why the States are no longer willing to uphold our inalienable right to have militias – doing so would identify the State as a hostile country). The principle has been more and more acknowledged that the unarmed citizen is to be spared in person, property, and honor as much as the exigencies of war will admit.

Clearly, the principle has been less acknowledged in the recent decades that the unarmed citizen is to be spared in person, property and honor. This seems to coincide with more and more people 'waking up.'

Article 23. Private citizens are no longer murdered, enslaved, or carried off to distant parts, and the inoffensive individual is as little disturbed in his private relations as the commander of the hostile troops can afford to grant in the overruling demands of a vigorous war.

I assume those who murdered, enslaved, or carried private citizens to distant parts (Guantanamo Bay perhaps?) didn't get this memo.

Article 24. The almost universal rule in remote times was, and continues to be with barbarous armies, that the private individual of the hostile country is destined to suffer every privation of liberty and protection and every disruption of family ties. The US fed govt. armies/militaries could be considered as "barbarous" based upon the actions they have taken upon the private individuals of the States as well as other nations. Protection was, and still is with uncivilized people (native inhabitants like Indians, aborigines, etc.), the exception.

INHUMAN TREATMENT: In the law of divorce. Such barbarous cruelty or severity as endangers the life or health of the party to whom it is addressed, or creates a well-founded apprehension of such danger.

Whaley v. Whaley, 68 Iowa, 647, 27 N. W. 809; Wells v. Wells, 116 Iowa, 59, 89 N. W. 98; Cole v. Cole, 23 Iowa, 433; Evans v. Evans, 82 Iowa, 462, 48 N. W. 809.

The phrase commonly employed in statutes is "cruel and inhuman treatment," from which it may be inferred that "inhumanity" is an extreme or aggravated "cruelty."

INTOLERABLE CRUELTY: In the law of divorce, this term denotes extreme cruelty, cruel and inhuman treatment, barbarous, savage, and inhuman conduct, and is equivalent to any of those phrases.

Shaw v. Shaw, 17 Conn. 193; Morehouse v. Morehouse, 70 Conn. 420, 39 Atl. 516; Blain v. Blain, 45 Vt. 544.

Ironic that Blacks Law Dictionary 2nd Edition 1910 does not define “barbarous” or the like.

Article 25. In modern regular wars of the Europeans and their descendants in other portions of the globe, protection of the inoffensive citizen of the hostile country is the rule; privation and disturbance of private relations are the exceptions.

PRIVATION: A taking away or withdrawing.
Co. Litt 239.

Article 26. Commanding generals may cause the magistrates and civil officers of the hostile country to take the oath of temporary allegiance or an oath of fidelity to their own victorious government or rulers (remember what I said earlier about how they ‘snuck’ their constitutions in by making them nearly identical with the organic constitutions), and they may expel every one who declines to do so.

But whether they do so or not, the people and their civil officers owe strict obedience to them as long as they hold sway over the district or country, at the peril of their lives.

Did I just put my life in peril by choosing to expose the Lieber Code and US fed govt.? “The people...” “owe strict obedience to them” ... ‘them’ being the victorious government or rulers.

Article 27. The law of war can no more wholly dispense with retaliation than can the law of nations, of which it is a branch. Yet civilized nations acknowledge retaliation as the sternest feature of war. A reckless enemy often leaves to his opponent no other means of securing himself against the repetition of barbarous outrage.

It appears those in the US fed govt. forgot this Article. The number of people who are retaliating against the repetitive barbarous actions of the US fed govt. in one way or another grows daily.

Article 28. Retaliation will therefore never be resorted to as a measure of mere revenge, but only as a means of protective retribution, and moreover cautiously and unavoidably--that is to say, retaliation shall only be resorted to after careful inquiry into the real occurrence and the character of the misdeeds that may demand retribution.

Unjust or inconsiderate retaliation removes the belligerents farther and farther from the mitigating rules of regular war, and by rapid steps leads them nearer to the internecine wars of savages.

The only time “internecine” appears in Blacks Law Dictionary (2nd edition 1910) is under:

WAR: -Articles of War: See ARTICLE.

—**Civil** war. An internece war. A war carried on between opposing masses of citizens of the same country or nation. Before the declaration of independence, the war between Great Britain and the United Colonies was a civil war; but instantly on that event the war changed its nature, and became a public war between independent governments.

Hubbard v. Exp. Co., 10 R. I. 244; Brown v. Hiatt, 4 Fed. Cas. 387- Prize Cases, 2 Black, 667, 17 L. Ed. 459; Central R. & B. Co. v. Ward, 37 Ga. 515.

While we're at it, let's look up "laws of war."

Articles: 3. A system of rules established by legal authority; as *articles* of war, *articles* of the navy, *articles* of faith, (see *infra*.)

War: - Articles of War: —Laws of war . See LAW

Article 29. Modern times are distinguished from earlier ages by the existence at one and the same time of many nations and great governments related to one another in close intercourse.

Peace is their normal condition; war is the exception. **We have been the exception since the Civil War (well over 100 years).** The ultimate object of all modern war is a renewed state of peace. **Where is our treaty of peace then?**

The more vigorously wars are pursued the better it is for humanity. **I do not believe humanity has received any real benefits during the past 100 years.** Sharp wars are brief.

Clearly the Civil War is not a "brief" war.

Article 30. Ever since the formation and coexistence of modern nations, and ever since wars have become great national wars, war has come to be acknowledged not to be its own end, but the means to obtain great ends of state, or to consist in defense against wrong (**"wrong" depends on whose definition of wrong is being used**); and no conventional restriction of the modes adopted to injure the enemy is any longer admitted; but the law of war imposes many limitations and restrictions on principles of justice, faith, and honor.

SECTION II

Public and private property of the enemy – Protection of persons, and especially of women; of religion, the arts and sciences – Punishment of crimes against the inhabitants of hostile countries.

Article 31. A victorious army (the US fed govt. army/military) appropriates all public money, seizes all public movable property (State taxes and any other movable property the State has obtained – water, mineral, etc. are considered to be movable property!) until further direction by its government (the US fed govt.), and sequesters for its own benefit or of that of its government all the revenues of real property (property taxes, and this shows why mineral rights never are included when one buys property) belonging to the hostile government or nation (which is taken from you and me to give to the US fed govt.). The title to such real property remains in abeyance during military occupation, and until the conquest is made complete.

Therefore no land patents / allodial titles are given when transferring property, but only deeds and certificates of titles are given. We own nothing. They (the US fed govt. and whomever really invaded the States) own it all.

Article 32. A victorious army, by the martial power inherent in the same, may suspend, change, or abolish, as far as the martial power extends, the relations which arise from the services due, according to the existing laws of the invaded country, from one citizen, subject, or native of the same to another.

The commander of the army must leave it to the ultimate treaty of peace to settle the permanency of this change.

Since there has been no treaty of peace, the permanency has not been settled. This means we could still “win the war” against the US fed govt. and that all is not lost – we can keep our republics!

Article 33. It is no longer considered lawful-- on the contrary, it is held to be a serious breach of the law of war--to force the subjects (We the People / inhabitants) of the enemy (the States / territories) into the service of the victorious government, (slavery / involuntary servitude – it can only be done voluntarily) except the latter should proclaim, after a fair and complete conquest of the hostile country or district, that it is resolved to keep the country, district, or place permanently as its own and make it a portion of its own country.

Without a treaty of peace, the Civil War has not ended, therefore, a complete conquest has not occurred.

Article 34. As a general rule, the property belonging to churches, to hospitals, or other establishments of an exclusively charitable character, to establishments of education, or foundations for the promotion of knowledge, whether public schools, universities, academies of learning or observatories, museums of the fine arts, or of a scientific character--such property is not to be considered public property in the sense of paragraph 31; but it may be taxed or used when the public service may require it.

So schools, churches, hospitals, etc are not to be considered as “public property,” however, they can be taxed or taken over (they say ‘used’).

Article 35. Classical works of art, libraries, scientific collections, or precious instruments, such as astronomical telescopes, as well as hospitals, must be secured against all avoidable injury, even when they are contained in fortified places whilst besieged or bombarded.

Do they – upon winning or losing the war – give such things back to the people/States, or do they always keep it as their own?

Article 36. If such works of art, libraries, collections, or instruments belonging to a hostile nation or government, can be removed without injury, the ruler of the conquering State or nation may order them to be seized and removed for the benefit of the said nation. **They do this for our “benefit.”**

The ultimate ownership is to be settled by the ensuing treaty of peace. In no case shall they be sold or given away, if captured by the armies of the United States, nor shall they ever be privately appropriated, or wantonly destroyed or injured.

Since no treaty of peace has occurred, ownership of such items are not settled – yet. By using the word “instruments,” I cannot help but wonder if that includes financial instruments or even gold/silver.

Article 37. The United States acknowledge and protect, in hostile countries occupied by them (**the States**), religion and morality (**so we still have freedom of religion under martial law**); strictly private property (what falls under “strictly private property?”); the persons of the inhabitants (**do they mean the corporations of inhabitants and not necessarily the inhabitants themselves?**), especially those of women; and the sacredness of domestic relations (**the sacredness of domestic relations was nullified by issuing marriage licenses**). Offenses to the contrary shall be rigorously punished. The States issuing marriage licenses shall (**must**) be rigorously punished, especially since they do not give full disclosure as to what that marriage license really is and what it does.

This rule does not interfere with the right of the victorious invader to tax the people or their property, to levy forced loans, to billet (**house**) soldiers, or to appropriate property, especially houses, lands, boats or ships, and the churches, for temporary and military uses.

Blacks Law Dictionary 2nd Edition 1910, regarding “domestic relationship”:

Husband and wife: One of the great domestic relationships; being that of a man and woman lawfully joined in marriage, by which, at common law, the legal existence of a wife is incorporated with that of her husband.

PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS: As used in constitutional law, this right includes personal freedom, freedom of contract, exemption from oppression or invidious discrimination, the right to follow one's individual preference in the choice of an

occupation and the application of his energies, liberty of conscience, and the right to enjoy the domestic relations and the privileges of the family and the home.

Black, Const Law (3d Ed.) p. 544. See *Ruhstrat v. People*, 185 111. 133, 57 N. E. 41, 49 L. R. A. 181, 76 Am. St. Rep. 30; *Hooper v. California*, 155 U. S. 648, 15 S. Ct. 207, 39 L. Ed. 297; *Butchers' Union, etc., Co. v. Crescent City Live Stock, etc., Co.*, 111 U. S. 746, 4 Sup. Ct 652, 28 L. Ed. 585.

What is a “forced loan?” In Blacks Law Dictionary 2nd Edition 1910, the term is used only twice:

BENEVOLENCE: In public law. Nominally a voluntary gratuity given by subjects to their king, but in reality a tax or forced loan.

JURO: In Spanish law. A certain perpetual pension, granted by the king on the public revenues, and more especially on the salt-works, by favor, either in consideration of meritorious services, or in return for money loaned the government, or obtained by it through forced loans. Escriche.

Article 38. Private property, unless forfeited by crimes or by offenses of the owner, can be seized only by way of military necessity, for the support or other benefit of the Army or of the United States. **“Other benefit of...” could be defined as anything.** If the owner has not fled, the commanding officer will cause receipts to be given, which may serve the spoliated owner to obtain indemnity.

SPOLIATION: In English ecclesiastical law. An injury done by one clerk or incumbent to another, in taking the fruits of his benefice without any right to them, but under a pretended title.

3 Bl. Comm. 90, 91.

The name of a suit sued out in the spiritual court to recover for the fruits of the church or for the church itself.

Fitzh. Nat. Brev. 85.

-In torts. Destruction of a thing by the act of a stranger, as the erasure or alteration of a writing by the act of a stranger, is called "spoliation." This has not the effect to destroy its character or legal effect.

1 Greenl. Ev. § 566; *Medlin v. Piatt County*, 8 Mo. 239, 40 Am. Dec. 135; *Crockett v. Thomason*, 5 Sneed (Tenn.) 344.

INDEMNITY: An indemnity is a collateral contract or assurance, by which one person engages to secure another against an anticipated loss or to prevent him from being damaged by the legal consequences of an act or forbearance on the part of one of the parties or of some third person. See Civ. Code Cal. § 2772, *Davis v. Phoenix Ins. Co.*, 111 Cal. 409, 43 Pac.1115; *Vandiver v. Pollak*, 107 Ala. 547, 19 South. 180, 54 Am. St. Rep. 118; *Henderson-Achert lithographic Co. v. John Shillito Co.*, 64 Ohio St 236, 60 N. B. 295, 83 Am. St. Rep. 745.

Thus, insurance is a contract of indemnity. So an Indemnifying bond is given to a sheriff who fears to proceed under an execution where the property is claimed by a stranger.

The term is also used to denote a compensation given to make the person whole from a loss already sustained; as where the government gives indemnity for private property taken by it for public use.

A legislative act, assuring a general dispensation from punishment or exemption from prosecution to persons involved in offenses, omissions of official duty, or acts in excess of authority, is called an indemnity; strictly it is an act of indemnity.

Article 39. The salaries of civil officers of the hostile government (**the States**) who remain in the invaded territory, and continue the work of their office, and can continue it according to the circumstances arising out of the war--such as judges, administrative or political officers, officers of city or communal governments--are paid from the public revenue of the invaded territory until the military government has reason wholly or partially to discontinue it. **Maybe those republic seats are not empty!** Salaries or incomes connected with purely honorary titles are always stopped.

EMINENCE: An honorary title given to cardinals. They were called "*illustriissimi*" and "*reverendissimi*" until the pontificate of Urban VIIL.

Article 40. There exists no law or body of authoritative rules of action between hostile armies, except that branch of the law of nature and nations which is called the law and usages of war on land.

NATURAL LAW: A rule of conduct arising out of the natural relations of human beings, established by the Creator, and existing prior to any positive precept Webster. The foundation of this law is placed by the best writers in the will of God, discovered by right reason, and aided by divine revelation; and its principles, when applicable, apply with equal obligation to individuals and to nations.

1 Kent, Comm. 2, note; Id. 4, note.

JUS NATURALE: The natural law, or law of nature; law, or legal principles, supposed to be discoverable by the light of nature or abstract reasoning, or to be taught by nature to all nations and men alike; or law supposed to govern men and peoples in a state of nature, *i. e.*, in advance of organized governments or enacted laws. This conceit originated with the philosophical jurists of Rome, and was gradually extended until the phrase came to denote a supposed basis or substratum common to all systems of positive law, and hence to be found, in greater or less purity, in the laws of all nations.

And, conversely, they held that if any rule or principle of law was observed in common by all peoples with whose systems they were acquainted, it must be a part of the *jus naturale*, or derived from it. Thus the phrases "*jus naturale*" and "*jus gentium*" cause to be used interchangeably.

LAW: -Absolute law. The true and proper law of nature, immutable in the abstract or in principle, in theory, but not in application; for very often the object, the reason, situation, and other circumstances, may vary its exercise and obligation.

1 Steph. Comm. 21 *et seq.*

CIVIL LAW: 2. That rule of action which every particular nation, commonwealth, or city has established peculiarly for itself; more properly called "municipal" law, to distinguish it from the "law of nature," and from international law.

The law which a people enacts is called the "civil law" of that people, but that law which natural reason appoints for all mankind is called the "law of nations," because all nations use it.

Bowyer, Mod. Civil Law, 19.

Jure natures sequum est neminem cunt

alterius detrimento et injuria fieri loeupletiorem : By the law of nature it is not just that any one should be enriched by the detriment or injury of another.

Dig. 50, 17, 206.

Quod ad jus naturale attinet ontres homines sequales sunt: All men are equal as far as the natural law is concerned.

Dig. 50, 17, 32.

Article 41. All municipal law of the ground on which the armies stand, or of the countries to which they belong, is silent and of no effect between armies in the field.

Municipal law does not effect armies.

Article 42. Slavery, complicating and confounding the ideas of property (that is, of a thing), and of personality (that is, of humanity), exists according to municipal or local law only. The law of nature and nations has never acknowledged it. The digest of the Roman law enacts the early dictum of the pagan jurist, that "so far as the law of nature is concerned, all men are equal." Fugitives escaping from a country in which they were slaves, villains, or serfs, into another country, have, for centuries past, been held free and acknowledged free by judicial decisions of European countries, even though the municipal law of the country in which the slave had taken refuge acknowledged slavery within its own dominions.

Slavery does not fall under "natural law."

Article 43. Therefore, in a war between the United States and a belligerent which admits of slavery (specifically the southern States that had slaves, Rhode Island, which was on the US fed govt. side, was also a slave State, just not a belligerent one), if a person held in bondage by that belligerent be captured by or come as a fugitive under the protection of the military forces of the United States, such

person is immediately entitled to the rights and privileges of a freeman. To return such person into slavery would amount to enslaving a free person, and neither the United States nor any officer under their authority can enslave any human being (**we can only be enslaved voluntarily**). Moreover, a person so made free by the law of war is under the shield of the law of nations, and the former owner or State can have, by the law of postliminy, no belligerent lien or claim of service.

POSTLIMINY: See POSTLIMINIUM

POSTLIMINIUM: Lat. In the civil law. A doctrine or fiction of the law by which the restoration of a person to any *status* or right formerly possessed by him was considered as relating back to the time of his original loss or deprivation; particularly in the case of one who, having been taken prisoner in war, and having escaped and returned to Rome, was regarded, by the aid of this fiction, as having never been abroad, and was thereby reinstated in all his rights.

Inst 1, 12, 5.

The term is also applied, in international law, to the recapture of property taken by an enemy, and its consequent restoration to its original owner.

Postliminium fingit enim qui captus est in civitate semper fuisse. Postliminy feigns that he who has been captured has never left the State.

Inst. 1, 12, 5; Dig. 49, 51.

Article 44. All wanton violence committed against persons in the invaded country, all destruction of property not commanded by the authorized officer, all robbery, all pillage or sacking, even after taking a place by main force, all rape, wounding, maiming, or killing of such inhabitants, are prohibited under the penalty of death, or such other severe punishment as may seem adequate for the gravity of the offense.

A soldier, officer, or private, in the act of committing such violence, and disobeying a superior ordering him to abstain from it, may be lawfully killed on the spot by such superior.

Article 45. All captures and booty belong, according to the modern law of war, primarily to the government of the captor.

Prize money, whether on sea or land, can now only be claimed under local law.

BOOTY: Property captured from the enemy in war, on land, as distinguished from "prize," which is a capture of such property on the sea.

U. S. v. Bales of Cotton, 28 Fed. Cas. 302; Coolidge v. Guthrie, 6 Fed. Cas. 461.

I wonder exactly what the US fed govt. will claim as booty now.

Article 46. Neither officers nor soldiers are allowed to make use of their position or power in the hostile country (**the States**) for private gain, not even for

commercial transactions otherwise legitimate. Offenses to the contrary committed by commissioned officers will be punished with cashiering or such other punishment as the nature of the offense may require; if by soldiers, they shall **(must)** be punished according to the nature of the offense.

Article 47. Crimes punishable by all penal codes, such as arson, murder, maiming, assaults, highway robbery, theft, burglary, fraud, forgery, and rape, if committed by an American soldier in a hostile country against its inhabitants, are not only punishable as at home, but in all cases in which death is not inflicted the severer punishment shall be preferred.

SECTION III

Deserters – Prisoners of war – Hostages – Booty on the battlefield.

Article 48. Deserters from the American Army, having entered the service of the enemy (**the States**), suffer death if they fall again into the hands of the United States, whether by capture or being delivered up to the American Army; and if a deserter from the enemy, having taken service in the Army of the United States, is captured by the enemy, and punished by them with death or otherwise, it is not a breach against the law and usages of war, requiring redress or retaliation.

Article 49. A prisoner of war is a public enemy armed or attached to the hostile army for active aid, who has fallen into the hands of the captor, either fighting or wounded, on the field or in the hospital, by individual surrender or by capitulation.

All soldiers, of whatever species of arms; all men who belong to the rising *en masse* of the hostile country; all those who are attached to the Army for its efficiency and promote directly the object of the war, except such as are hereinafter provided for; all disabled men or officers on the field or elsewhere, if captured; all enemies who have thrown away their arms and ask for quarter, are prisoners of war, and as such exposed to the inconveniences as well as entitled to the privileges of a prisoner of war.

Article 50. Moreover, citizens who accompany an army for whatever purpose, such as sutlers, editors, or reporters of journals, or contractors, if captured, may be made prisoners of war and be detained as such.

The monarch and members of the hostile reigning family, male or female, the chief, and chief officers of the hostile government, its diplomatic agents, and all persons who are of particular and singular use and benefit to the hostile army or its government, are, if captured on belligerent ground, and if unprovided with a safe-conduct granted by the captor's government, prisoners of war.

SUTLER: A person who, as a business, follows an army and sells provisions and liquor to the troops.

Article 51. If the people of that portion of an invaded country which is not yet occupied by the enemy, or of the whole country, at the approach of a hostile army, rise, under a duly authorized levy, *en masse* to resist the invader, they are now treated as public enemies, and, if captured, are prisoners of war.

Article 52. No belligerent has the right to declare that he will treat every captured man in arms of a levy *en masse* as a brigand or bandit.

If, however, the people of a country, or any portion of the same, already occupied by an army, rise against it, they are violators of the laws of war and are not entitled to their protection.

BANDIT: An outlaw; a man *banned*, or put under a ban; a brigand or robber. *Banditti*, a band of rubbers.

Article 53. The enemy's chaplains, officers of the medical staff, apothecaries, hospital nurses, and servants, if they fall into the hands of the American Army, are not prisoners of war, unless the commander has reasons to retain them. In this latter case, or if, at their own desire, they are allowed to remain with their captured companions, they are treated as prisoners of war, and may be exchanged if the commander sees fit.

Article 54. A hostage is a person accepted as a pledge for the fulfillment of an agreement concluded between belligerents during the war, or in consequence of a war. Hostages are rare in the present age.

Article 55. If a hostage is accepted, he is treated like a prisoner of war, according to rank and condition, as circumstances may admit.

Article 56. A prisoner of war is subject to no punishment for being a public enemy, nor is any revenge wreaked upon him by the intentional infliction of any suffering, or disgrace, by cruel imprisonment, want of food, by mutilation, death, or any other barbarity.

I'm not sure whether everyone received this memo. Never mind, ignorance of the law is not an excuse, right?

Article 57. So soon as a man is armed by a sovereign government and takes the soldier's oath of fidelity he is a belligerent (this seems to also say that the US fed govt. is not a sovereign government); his killing, wounding, or other warlike acts are not individual crimes or offenses. No belligerent has a right to declare that enemies of a certain class, color, or condition, when properly organized as soldiers, will not be treated by him as public enemies.

Are they actually dictating what belligerents can / can't do? It certainly seems to be the case here.

Article 58. The law of nations knows of no distinction of color, and if an enemy of the United States should enslave and sell any captured persons of their Army, it would be a case for the severest retaliation, if not redressed upon complaint.

The United States cannot retaliate by enslavement; therefore death must be the retaliation for this crime against the law of nations.

This explains the situation at Waco and other similar instances...such people be killed.

Article 59. A prisoner of war remains answerable for his crimes committed against the captor's army or people, committed before he was captured, and for which he has not been punished by his own authorities.

All prisoners of war are liable to the infliction of retaliatory measures.

Article 60. It is against the usage of modern war to resolve, in hatred and revenge, to give no quarter. No body of troops has the right to declare that it will

not give, and therefore will not expect, quarter; but a commander is permitted to direct his troops to give no quarter, in great straits, when his own salvation makes it impossible to cumber himself with prisoners.

Article 61. Troops that give no quarter have no right to kill enemies already disabled on the ground, or prisoners captured by other troops.

Article 62. All troops of the enemy known or discovered to give no quarter in general, or to any portion of the Army, receive none.

Article 63. Troops who fight in the uniform of their enemies, without any plain, striking, and uniform mark of distinction of their own, can expect no quarter.

Article 64. If American troops capture a train containing uniforms of the enemy, and the commander considers it advisable to distribute them for use among his men, some striking mark or sign must be adopted to distinguish the American soldier from the enemy.

In other words, infiltration.

Article 65. The use of the enemy's national standard, flag, or other emblem of nationality, for the purpose of deceiving the enemy in battle, is an act of perfidy by which they lose all claim to the protection of the laws of war.

They still use the national (State) flags in all 50 States! Therefore, the US fed govt. lost all claims to the protection of the laws of war. Even though the 'battle' is not outright fought, the battle continues because there is still no treaty of peace.

Article 66. Quarter having been given to an enemy by American troops, under a misapprehension of his true character, he may, nevertheless, be ordered to suffer death if, within three days after the battle, it be discovered that he belongs to a corps which gives no quarter.

Article 67. The law of nations allows every sovereign government to make war upon another sovereign State, and, therefore, admits of no rules or laws different from those of regular warfare, regarding the treatment of prisoners of war, although they may belong to the army of a government which the captor may consider as a wanton and unjust assailant.

Sovereign States formed the army for the US fed govt. and fought sovereign States. The US fed govt. could not have done this without the sovereign States assistance. It seems both the northern and southern States were deceived by the US fed govt.

Article 68. Modern wars are not internecine wars, in which the killing of the enemy is the object. The destruction of the enemy in modern war, and, indeed, modern war itself, are means to obtain that object of the belligerent which lies beyond the war.

Unnecessary or revengeful destruction of life is not lawful.
Waco and many other instances / occurrences clearly were not lawful!

Article 69. Outposts, sentinels (guards), or pickets are not to be fired upon, except to drive them in, or when a positive order, special or general, has been issued to that effect.

Article 70. The use of poison in any manner, be it to poison wells (fluoride), or food (aspartame, pesticides, steroids in cattle, chicken, etc.), or arms, is wholly excluded from modern warfare. He that uses it puts himself out of the pale of the law and usages of war.

It seems the US fed govt. has forgotten this memo as well!

Article 71. Whoever intentionally inflicts additional wounds on an enemy already wholly disabled, or kills such an enemy, or who orders or encourages soldiers to do so, shall suffer death, if duly convicted, whether he belongs to the Army of the United States, or is an enemy captured after having committed his misdeed.

Article 72. Money and other valuables on the person of a prisoner, such as watches or jewelry, as well as extra clothing, are regarded by the American Army as the private property of the prisoner, and the appropriation of such valuables or money is considered dishonorable, and is prohibited.

Nevertheless, if large sums are found upon the persons of prisoners, or in their possession, they shall be taken from them, and the surplus, after providing for their own support, appropriated for the use of the Army, under the direction of the commander, unless otherwise ordered by the Government. Is this how law enforcement etc obtain cars, homes, the funds received from auctions of such property, etc.? Nor can prisoners claim, as private property, large sums found and captured in their train, although they have been placed in the private luggage of the prisoners.

Article 73. All officers, when captured, must surrender their side-arms to the captor. They may be restored to the prisoner in marked cases, by the commander, to signalize admiration of his distinguished bravery, or approbation of his humane treatment of prisoners before his capture. The captured officer to whom they may be restored cannot wear them during captivity.

Article 74. A prisoner of war, being a public enemy, is the prisoner of the Government and not of the captor. No ransom can be paid by a prisoner of war to his individual captor, or to any officer in command (wouldn't this also be called bribery?). The Government alone releases captives, according to rules prescribed by itself.

Article 75. Prisoners of war are subject to confinement or imprisonment such as may be deemed necessary on account of safety, but they are to be subjected to

no other intentional suffering or indignity. The confinement and mode of treating a prisoner may be varied during his captivity according to the demands of safety.

Article 76. Prisoners of war shall be fed upon plain and wholesome food, whenever practicable, and treated with humanity.

They may be required to work for the benefit of the captor's government, according to their rank and condition.

Isn't this considered to be slavery / servitude? I know I read enslaving someone is not permitted. By using the word "work," do they mean they will be paid?

Article 77. A prisoner of war who escapes may be shot, or otherwise killed, in his flight; but neither death nor any other punishment shall be inflicted upon him simply for his attempt to escape, which the law of war does not consider a crime. Stricter means of security shall be used after an unsuccessful attempt at escape.

If, however, a conspiracy is discovered, the purpose of which is a united or general escape, the conspirators may be rigorously punished, even with death; and capital punishment may also be inflicted upon prisoners of war discovered to have plotted rebellion against the authorities of the captors, whether in union with fellow-prisoners or other persons.

Article 78. If prisoners of war, having given no pledge nor made any promise on their honor, forcibly or otherwise escape, and are captured again in battle, after having rejoined their own army, they shall not be punished for their escape, but shall be treated as simple prisoners of war, although they will be subjected to stricter confinement.

Article 79. Every captured wounded enemy shall be medically treated, according to the ability of the medical staff.

Article 80. Honorable men, when captured, will abstain from giving to the enemy information concerning their own army, and the modern law of war permits no longer the use of any violence against prisoners in order to extort the desired information, or to punish them for having given false information.

SECTION IV

Partisans – Armed enemies not belonging to the hostile army – Scouts – Armed prowlers – War-rebels

Article 81. Partisans are soldiers armed and wearing the uniform of their army, but belonging to a corps which acts detached from the main body for the purpose of making inroads into the territory occupied by the enemy. If captured they are entitled to all the privileges of the prisoner of war.

Article 82. Men, or squads of men, who commit hostilities, whether by fighting, or inroads for destruction or plunder, or by raids of any kind, without commission, without being part and portion of the organized hostile army, and without sharing continuously in the war, but who do so with intermitting returns to their homes and avocations, or with the occasional assumption of the semblance of peaceful pursuits, divesting themselves of the character or appearance of soldiers--such men, or squads of men, are not public enemies, and therefore, if captured, are not entitled to the privileges of prisoners of war, but shall be treated summarily as highway robbers or pirates.

Article 83. Scouts or single soldiers, if disguised in the dress of the country, or in the uniform of the army hostile to their own, employed in obtaining information, if found within or lurking about the lines of the captor, are treated as spies, and suffer death.

Article 84. Armed prowlers, by whatever names they may be called, or persons of the enemy's territory, who steal within the lines of the hostile army for the purpose of robbing, killing, or of destroying bridges, roads, or canals, or of robbing or destroying the mail, or of cutting the telegraph wires, are not entitled to the privileges of the prisoner of war.

Article 85. War-rebels are persons within an occupied territory who rise in arms against the occupying or conquering army, or against the authorities established by the same (such as State militias, etc). If captured, they may suffer death, whether they rise singly, in small or large bands, and whether called upon to do so by their own, but expelled, government or not. They are not prisoners of war; nor are they if discovered and secured before their conspiracy has matured to an actual rising or to armed violence.

SECTION V

Safe-conduct – Spies – War-traitors – Captured messengers – Abuse of the flag of truce

Article 86. All intercourse between the territories occupied by belligerent armies, whether by traffic, by letter, by travel, or in any other way, ceases. This is the general rule, to be observed without special proclamation.

Exceptions to this rule, whether by safe-conduct or permission to trade on a small or large scale, or by exchanging mails, or by travel from one territory into the other, can take place only according to agreement approved by the Government or by the highest military authority.

Contraventions of this rule are highly punishable.

Article 87. Ambassadors, and all other diplomatic agents of neutral powers accredited to the enemy may receive safe-conducts through the territories occupied by the belligerents, unless there are military reasons to the contrary, and unless they may reach the place of their destination conveniently by another route. It implies no international affront if the safe-conduct is declined. Such passes are usually given by the supreme authority of the State and not by subordinate officers.

Article 88. A spy is a person who secretly, in disguise or under false pretense, seeks information with the intention of communicating it to the enemy.

The spy is punishable with death by hanging by the neck, whether or not he succeed in obtaining the information or in conveying it to the enemy.

Article 89. If a citizen of the United States (originally in the DC area) obtains information in a legitimate manner and betrays it to the enemy, be he a military or civil officer, or a private citizen, he shall suffer death.

Article 90. A traitor under the law of war, or a war-traitor, is a person in a place or district under martial law (the 50 States and territories-like Puerto Rico, etc.) who, unauthorized by the military commander, gives information of any kind to the enemy, or holds intercourse with him.

Article 91. The war-traitor is always severely punished. If his offense consists in betraying to the enemy anything concerning the condition, safety, operations, or plans of the troops holding or occupying the place or district, his punishment is death.

Article 92. If the citizen or subject of a country or place invaded or conquered gives information to his own government, from which he is separated by the hostile army, or to the army of his government, he is a war-traitor, and death is the penalty of his offense.

Article 93. All armies in the field stand in need of guides, and impress them if they cannot obtain them otherwise.

Article 94. No person having been forced by the enemy to serve as guide is punishable for having done so.

Article 95. If a citizen of a hostile and invaded district voluntarily serves as a guide to the enemy, or offers to do so, he is deemed a war-traitor and shall suffer death.

Article 96. A citizen serving voluntarily as a guide against his own country commits treason, and will be dealt with according to the law of his country.

Article 97. Guides, when it is clearly proved that they have misled intentionally, may be put to death.

Article 98. All unauthorized or secret communication with the enemy is considered treasonable by the law of war.

Foreign residents in an invaded or occupied territory or foreign visitors in the same can claim no immunity from this law. They may communicate with foreign parts or with the inhabitants of the hostile country, so far as the military authority permits, but no further. Instant expulsion from the occupied territory would be the very least punishment for the infraction of this rule.

Article 99. A messenger carrying written dispatches or verbal messages from one portion of the army or from a besieged place to another portion of the same army or its government, if armed, and in the uniform of his army, and if captured while doing so in the territory occupied by the enemy, is treated by the captor as a prisoner of war. If not in uniform nor a soldier, the circumstances connected with his capture must determine the disposition that shall be made of him.

Article 100. A messenger or agent who attempts to steal through the territory occupied by the enemy to further in any manner the interests of the enemy, if captured, is not entitled to the privileges of the prisoner of war, and may be dealt with according to the circumstances of the case.

Article 101. While deception in war is admitted as a just and necessary means of hostility, and is consistent with honorable warfare, the common law of war allows even capital punishment for clandestine or treacherous attempts to injure an enemy, because they are so dangerous, and it is so difficult to guard against them.

Article 102. The law of war, like the criminal law regarding other offenses, makes no difference on account of the difference of sexes, concerning the spy, the war-traitor, or the war-rebel.

Article 103. Spies, war-traitors, and war-rebels are not exchanged according to the common law of war. The exchange of such persons would require a special cartel, authorized by the Government, or, at a great distance from it, by the chief commander of the army in the field.

Article 104. A successful spy or war-traitor, safely returned to his own army, and afterward captured as an enemy, is not subject to punishment for his acts as a spy or war-traitor, but he may be held in closer custody as a person individually dangerous.

SECTION VI

Exchange of prisoners – Flags of truce – Flags of protection.

Article 105. Exchanges of prisoners take place--number for number--rank for rank--wounded for wounded--with added condition for added condition--such, for instance, as not to serve for a certain period.

Article 106. In exchanging prisoners of war, such numbers of persons of inferior rank may be substituted as an equivalent for one of superior rank as may be agreed upon by cartel, which requires the sanction of the Government, or of the commander of the army in the field.

Article 107. A prisoner of war is in honor bound truly to state to the captor his rank; and he is not to assume a lower rank than belongs to him, in order to cause a more advantageous exchange, nor a higher rank, for the purpose of obtaining better treatment.

Offenses to the contrary have been justly punished by the commanders of released prisoners, and may be good cause for refusing to release such prisoners.

Article 108. The surplus number of prisoners of war remaining after an exchange has taken place is sometimes released either for the payment of a stipulated sum of money, or, in urgent cases, of provision, clothing, or other necessaries.

Such arrangement, however, requires the sanction of the highest authority.

Article 109. The exchange of prisoners of war is an act of convenience to both belligerents. If no general cartel has been concluded, it cannot be demanded by either of them. No belligerent is obliged to exchange prisoners of war.

A cartel is voidable as soon as either party has violated it.

Article 110. No exchange of prisoners shall be made except after complete capture, and after an accurate account of them, and a list of the captured officers, has been taken.

Article 111. The bearer of a flag of truce cannot insist upon being admitted. He must always be admitted with great caution. Unnecessary frequency is carefully to be avoided.

Article 112. If the bearer of a flag of truce offer himself during an engagement, he can be admitted as a very rare exception only. It is no breach of good faith to retain such flag of truce, if admitted during the engagement. Firing is not required to cease on the appearance of a flag of truce in battle.

Article 113. If the bearer of a flag of truce, presenting himself during an engagement, is killed or wounded, it furnishes no ground of complaint whatever.

Article 114. If it be discovered, and fairly proved, that a flag of truce has been abused for surreptitiously obtaining military knowledge, the bearer of the flag thus abusing his sacred character is deemed a spy.

So sacred is the character of a flag of truce, and so necessary is its sacredness, that while its abuse is an especially heinous offense, great caution is requisite, on the other hand, in convicting the bearer of a flag of truce as a spy.

Article 115. It is customary to designate by certain flags (usually yellow) the hospitals in places which are shelled, so that the besieging enemy may avoid firing on them. The same has been done in battles when hospitals are situated within the field of the engagement.

Article 116. Honorable belligerents often request that the hospitals within the territory of the enemy may be designated, so that they may be spared.

An honorable belligerent allows himself to be guided by flags or signals of protection as much as the contingencies and the necessities of the fight will permit.

Article 117. It is justly considered an act of bad faith, of infamy or fiendishness, to deceive the enemy by flags of protection. Such act of bad faith may be good cause for refusing to respect such flags.

Article 118. The besieging belligerent has sometimes requested the besieged to designate the buildings containing collections of works of art, scientific museums, astronomical observatories, or precious libraries, so that their destruction may be avoided as much as possible.

SECTION VII

The parole.

Article 119. Prisoners of war may be released from captivity by exchange, and, under certain circumstances, also by parole.

Article 120. The term parole designates the pledge of individual good faith and honor to do, or to omit doing, certain acts after he who gives his parole shall have been dismissed, wholly or partially, from the power of the captor.

Article 121. The pledge of the parole is always an individual, but not a private act.

Article 122. The parole applies chiefly to prisoners of war whom the captor allows to return to their country, or to live in greater freedom within the captor's country or territory, on conditions stated in the parole.

Article 123. Release of prisoners of war by exchange is the general rule; release by parole is the exception.

Article 124. Breaking the parole is punished with death when the person breaking the parole is captured again.

Accurate lists, therefore, of the paroled persons must be kept by the belligerents.

Article 125. When paroles are given and received there must be an exchange of two written documents, in which the name and rank of the paroled individuals are accurately and truthfully stated.

Article 126. Commissioned officers only are allowed to give their parole, and they can give it only with the permission of their superior, as long as a superior in rank is within reach.

Article 127. No non-commissioned officer or private can give his parole except through an officer. Individual paroles not given through an officer are not only void, but subject the individuals giving them to the punishment of death as deserters. The only admissible exception is where individuals, properly separated from their commands, have suffered long confinement without the possibility of being paroled through an officer.

Article 128. No paroling on the battle-field; no paroling of entire bodies of troops after a battle; and no dismissal of large numbers of prisoners, with a general declaration that they are paroled, is permitted, or of any value.

Article 129. In capitulations for the surrender of strong places or fortified camps the commanding officer, in cases of urgent necessity, may agree that the troops

under his command shall not fight again during the war unless exchanged.

Article 130. The usual pledge given in the parole is not to serve during the existing war unless exchanged.

This pledge refers only to the active service in the field against the paroling belligerent or his allies actively engaged in the same war. These cases of breaking the parole are patent acts, and can be visited with the punishment of death; but the pledge does not refer to internal service, such as recruiting or drilling the recruits, fortifying places not besieged, quelling civil commotions, fighting against belligerents unconnected with the paroling belligerents, or to civil or diplomatic service for which the paroled officer may be employed.

Article 131. If the government does not approve of the parole, the paroled officer must return into captivity, and should the enemy refuse to receive him he is free of his parole.

Article 132. A belligerent government may declare, by a general order, whether it will allow paroling and on what conditions it will allow it. Such order is communicated to the enemy.

Article 133. No prisoner of war can be forced by the hostile government to parole himself, and no government is obliged to parole prisoners of war or to parole all captured officers, if it paroles any. As the pledging of the parole is an individual act, so is paroling, on the other hand, an act of choice on the part of the belligerent.

Article 134. The commander of an occupying army may require of the civil officers of the enemy, and of its citizens, any pledge he may consider necessary for the safety or security of his army, and upon their failure to give it he may arrest, confine, or detain them.

SECTION VIII

Armistice – Capitulation.

Article 135. An armistice is the cessation of active hostilities for a period agreed between belligerents. It must be agreed upon in writing and duly ratified by the highest authorities of the contending parties.

ARMISTICE: A suspending or cessation of hostilities between belligerent nations or forces for a considerable time.

Article 136. If an armistice be declared without conditions it extends no further than to require a total cessation of hostilities along the front of both belligerents.

If conditions be agreed upon, they should be clearly expressed, and must be rigidly adhered to by both parties. If either party violates any express condition, the armistice may be declared null and void by the other.

Article 137. An armistice may be general, and valid for all points and lines of the belligerents; or special--that is, referring to certain troops or certain localities only. An armistice may be concluded for a definite time; or for an indefinite time, during which either belligerent may resume hostilities on giving the notice agreed upon to the other.

Article 138. The motives which induce the one or the other belligerent to conclude an armistice, whether it be expected to be preliminary to a treaty of peace, or to prepare during the armistice for a more vigorous prosecution of the war, does in no way affect the character of the armistice itself.

Article 139. An armistice is binding upon the belligerents from the day of the agreed commencement; but the officers of the armies are responsible from the day only when they receive official information of its existence.

Article 140. Commanding officers have the right to conclude armistices binding on the district over which their command extends, but such armistice is subject to the ratification of the superior authority, and ceases so soon as it is made known to the enemy that the armistice is not ratified, even if a certain time for the elapsing between giving notice of cessation and the resumption of hostilities should have been stipulated for.

Article 141. It is incumbent upon the contracting parties of an armistice to stipulate what intercourse of persons or traffic between the inhabitants of the territories occupied by the hostile armies shall be allowed, if any.

If nothing is stipulated the intercourse remains suspended, as during actual hostilities.

Article 142. An armistice is not a partial or a temporary peace; it is only the suspension of military operations to the extent agreed upon by the parties.

Article 143. When an armistice is concluded between a fortified place and the army besieging it, it is agreed by all the authorities on this subject that the besieger must cease all extension, perfection, or advance of his attacking works as much so as from attacks by main force.

But as there is a difference of opinion among martial jurists whether the besieged have a right to repair breaches or to erect new works of defense within the place during an armistice, this point should be determined by express agreement between the parties.

Article 144. So soon as a capitulation is signed the capitulator has no right to demolish, destroy, or injure the works, arms, stores, or ammunition in his possession, during the time which elapses between the signing and the execution of the capitulation, unless otherwise stipulated in the same.

Article 145. When an armistice is clearly broken by one of the parties the other party is released from all obligation to observe it.

Article 146. Prisoners taken in the act of breaking an armistice must be treated as prisoners of war, the officer alone being responsible who gives the order for such a violation of an armistice. The highest authority of the belligerent aggrieved may demand redress for the infraction of an armistice.

Article 147. Belligerents sometimes conclude an armistice while their plenipotentiaries are met to discuss the conditions of a treaty of peace; but plenipotentiaries may meet without a preliminary armistice; in the latter case the war is carried on without any abatement.

Maybe I should begin searching for an armistice instead of looking for a treaty of peace.

ARMISTICE: A suspending or cessation of hostilities between belligerent nations or forces for a considerable time.

Laws of war: This term denotes a branch or public international law, and comprises the body of rules and principles observed by civilized nations for the regulation of matters inherent in, or incidental to, the conduct of a public war; such, for example, as the relations of neutrals and belligerents, blockades, captures, prizes, truces and armistices, capitulations, prisoners, and declarations of war and peace.

TRUCE: In international law. A suspension or temporary cessation of hostilities by agreement between belligerent powers; an armistice.

Wheat. Int. Law, 442.

Even though “armistice” is mentioned here, it does not state that an “armistice” would end the war. Remember, only a treaty of peace can officially do that.

SECTION IX

Assassination.

Article 148. The law of war does not allow proclaiming either an individual belonging to the hostile army, or a citizen, or a subject of the hostile government an outlaw, who may be slain without trial by any captor, any more than the modern law of peace allows such international outlawry; on the contrary, it abhors such outrage. The sternest retaliation should follow the murder committed in consequence of such proclamation, made by whatever authority. Civilized nations look with horror upon offers of rewards for the assassination of enemies as relapses into barbarism.

Since the word “subject” has been used a number of times now, I thought it would be important to include the definition as well.

SUBJECT: In logic. That concerning which the affirmation in a proposition is made; the first word in a proposition. An individual matter considered as the object of legislation. The constitutions of several of the states require that every act of the legislature shall relate to but one *subject*, which shall be expressed in the title of the statute.

See *Ex parte Thomas*, 113 Ala. 1, 21 South. 369; *In re Mayer*, 50 N. Y. 504; *State v. County Treasurer*, 4 S. C. 528; *Johnson v. Harrison*, 47 Minn. 577, 50 N. W. 923, 28 Am. St Rep. 382

-In constitutional law: One that owes allegiance to a sovereign and is governed by his laws. The natives of Great Britain are *subjects* of the British government. Men in free governments are subjects as well as *citizens*; as citizens they enjoy rights and franchises; as subjects they are bound to obey the laws. Webster. The term is little used, in this sense, in countries enjoying a republican form of government.

See *The Pizarro*, 2 Wheat. 245, 4 L. Ed. 226; *U. S. v. Wong Kim Ark*, 169 U. S. 649, 18 Sup. Ct 456, 42 L. Ed. 890

SECTION X

Insurrection – Civil war – Rebellion.

Article 149. Insurrection is the rising of people in arms (such as a militia) against their government, or portion of it, or against one or more of its laws, or against an officer or officers of the government. It may be confined to mere armed resistance, or it may have greater ends in view.

Article 150. Civil war is war between two or more portions of a country or State, each contending for the mastery of the whole, and each claiming to be the legitimate government. So there are literally two governments/countries in place at the same time. How do the people know which one is truly their govt., especially if one appears to be the same as the other one? Remember what I said about the US fed govt. creating Constitutions that were nearly identical to the organic Constitution(s). The term is also sometimes applied to war of rebellion, when the rebellious provinces or portions of the State are contiguous to those containing the seat of government.

Article 151. The term rebellion is applied to an insurrection of large extent, and is usually a war between the legitimate government of a country and portions of provinces of the same who seek to throw off their allegiance to it and set up a government of their own.

It appears they actually told the people what they were really doing regarding the Civil War. This holds especially true for the States that had seceded. Yet I can't help but think the northern States were equally deceived.

Article 152. When humanity induces the adoption of the rules of regular war toward rebels, whether the adoption is partial or entire, it does in no way whatever imply a partial or complete acknowledgment of their government, if they have set up one, or of them, as an independent or sovereign power. By 'obeying' the US fed govt. rules, it does not imply any acknowledgement of their govt. Through the "Pledge of Allegiance," we have been brainwashed into believing the US fed govt. is the 50 States, when it is clearly not so. We ought to be pledging allegiance to our own respective States (the one we currently live in). This would keep the US fed govt. at arms length when having to deal with their laws, rules, etc. Neutrals have no right to make the adoption of the rules of war by the assailed government toward rebels on the ground of their own acknowledgment of the revolted people as an independent power.

Have our States become "neutrals" by simple acquiescence or acknowledgment of the US fed govt.?

Article 153. Treating captured rebels (militias, etc.) as prisoners of war, exchanging them, concluding of cartels, capitulations, or other warlike agreements with them; addressing officers of a rebel army by the rank they may have in the same; accepting flags of truce; or, on the other hand, proclaiming martial law in their territory (which is not mandatory to do), or levying war taxes

or forced loans ([taxes](#)), or doing any other act sanctioned or demanded by the law and usages of public war between sovereign belligerents, neither proves nor establishes an acknowledgment of the rebellious people, or of the government which they may have erected, as a public or sovereign power. Nor does the adoption of the rules of war toward rebels imply an engagement with them extending beyond the limits of these rules. It is victory in the field that ends the strife and settles the future relations between the contending parties.

[They take taxes out before we even see or receive our paychecks ... this must also be considered a “forced loan.” We are forced to make loans to the US fed govt.](#)

CARTEL: An agreement between two hostile powers for the delivery of prisoners or deserters. Also a written challenge to fight a duel.

Article 154. Treating in the field the rebellious enemy according to the law and usages of war has never prevented the legitimate government from trying the leaders of the rebellion or chief rebels for high treason, and from treating them accordingly, unless they are included in a general amnesty.

[All of the States had a legitimate government prior to and during the Civil War. I can only assume they still have their legitimate governments, since there has been no treaty of peace. Therefore, they could have tried Lincoln and many others for high treason \(assuming they were not included in a general amnesty\), which includes those in office who are usurping the powers of the States today.](#)

Article 155. All enemies in regular war are divided into two general classes--that is to say, into combatants and non-combatants, or unarmed citizens of the hostile government.

The military commander of the legitimate government ([the States](#)), in a war of rebellion, distinguishes between the loyal citizen in the revolted portion of the country and the disloyal citizen. The disloyal citizens may further be classified into those citizens known to sympathize with the rebellion without positively aiding it, and those who, without taking up arms, give positive aid and comfort to the rebellious enemy without being bodily forced thereto.

[Here is where the term “sympathizers” came from. This seems to be addressing the people in the northern States who did not agree with the US fed govt. as well as the people in the southern States who did not agree with their State govt./President Davis.](#)

Article 156. Common justice and plain expediency require that the military commander protect the manifestly loyal citizens in revolted territories against the hardships of the war as much as the common misfortune of all war admits.

The commander will throw the burden of the war, as much as lies within his power, on the disloyal citizens, of the revolted portion or province, subjecting them to a stricter police than the non-combatant enemies have to suffer in regular war; and if he deems it appropriate, or if his government demands of him that every citizen shall, by an oath of allegiance, or by some other manifest act,

declare his fidelity to the legitimate government, he may expel, transfer, imprison, or fine the revolted citizens who refuse to pledge themselves anew as citizens obedient to the law and loyal to the government.

Whether it is expedient to do so, and whether reliance can be placed upon such oaths, the commander or his government have the right to decide.

The US fed govt. created “loyal citizens” by having the children say the “Pledge of Allegiance.” The children grew up believing the US fed govt. was the ‘legitimate govt.’ when it was the State govt.’s that were (and still are) legitimate.

Article 157. Armed or unarmed resistance by citizens of the United States against the lawful movements of their troops is levying war against the United States, and is therefore treason.

RESISTANCE: The act of resisting opposition; the employment of forcible means to prevent the execution of an endeavor in which force is employed.

See U. S. v. Jose (C. C.) 63 Fed. 954; U. S. v. Huff (C. C.) 13 Fed. 639.

A final thought – President Davis was captured. That event led many to assume the Civil War was over, however, the Lieber Code clearly states that only a treaty of peace can end the war.

I Offer A Solution

While I do not proclaim to know it all, and I realize I am leaving this book with some unanswered questions, I did promise to offer a solution. I wholeheartedly believe this is a viable, workable, and do-able solution.

We need to create and establish a Treaty of Peace between the States and the US fed govt. to end the Civil War. While this is honestly quite simple, do not think for a second that I believe this will be easy.

Considering our true and valid Congress has not been seated since the Civil War, there are some challenges that arise. For instance, the States that came into the union after the Civil War; there is no way they were properly ratified into the union. However, I am not willing to abandon people in other States simply because of the US fed govt.'s admitted deceitful ways.

I believe having the participation of *all* States, as well as the nations we currently have treaties with, will not only be beneficial to the success of the treaty of peace being completed and established, but crucial in the worlds' recognition of our reestablished republics. Once the treaty is established, the States, which entered the union after the Civil War can be officially and correctly ratified into the union, if they so choose.

Without the treaty of peace, I do not see how we will be able to end the usurpations and the far-reaching tentacles of the US fed govt., which have been achieved through martial law. We need to put them back in their place (the prescribed 10 mile radius between Maryland and Virginia), and ensure they never get a hold on the States and We the People again. This means we must begin holding our own respective States accountable for any and all forfeitures of our property and ensuring all inalienable rights which have been traded (unknowingly by We the People) for 'benefits' (such as the right to travel vs. drivers license) are null and void.

All treaties are included / addressed in the Constitution for the united States of America and the Constitution of the United States to be held as 'law of the land.' That is why I have obtained and included a complete list of said treaties, as well as the resources I have used to put this book together.

I am positive our learning about them would prove beneficial. Those nations who had treaties with the united States of America / US very well may join us to ensure those treaties are enforced as well. It is our duty to ensure all treaties are to be fully honored, especially if we, over a hundred years later, are working on a treaty of peace.

Additionally, if you do not know the Constitution, you'd best learn it, as well as your respective States Constitutions. The Constitution clearly states that any powers *not* given to the US fed govt. fall upon the States, and any powers that the States are *not* given fall upon We the People. This also includes those powers that they are ignoring (such as protecting our borders). Since the US fed govt. and the States are not assisting or supporting State militias, that responsibility falls upon We the People!

I, for one, am no longer willing to allow my rights to be infringed upon, usurped, or abused. I am fully aware that when I stand for myself, I am

automatically standing for you. This does not mean that I accept responsibility for you! I know if I allow such things to happen to another, one day, they will happen to me. The authority to take the actions I have chosen is within me – we each, individually have the authority. However, the power (enforcement) comes only when we stand together as one!

If you are interested in participating in the formation and implementation of a treaty between the States and the US fed govt., please send an email to Treaty@WeRoar.ws

Please visit www.AgainstGovernmentCorruption.org/content/michael-badnarik-constitutional-class to view Michael Badnarik's Constitutional Class video (you may also download them for your convenience). You can obtain more information at his website, <http://www.ConstitutionPreservation.org/>

Please visit www.TalkShoe.com/tc/79065 (date 9/6/2010) and listen to Schaeffer Cox speak about the successful and lawful Alaska militia, and to hear Michael Badnarik speak about the Constitution and your rights. You can also hear Michael Badnarik on 2 other interviews dated 8/21/2009 and 3/2/2010 as well.

Treaties:

- 1776 – Plan of the Treaties with France of 1778; Sept. 17
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/diplomacy/france/fr1778p.asp
- 1776 – Treaties with France: Instructions to the Agent; Sept 24
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/diplomacy/france/fr1778i.asp
- 1778 – France: Treaties of 1778 & Associated Documents
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/fr1778m.asp
- 1778 – Exchange of Notes Referring to Articles 2 & 3 of the Treaty of Amity and Commerce with France of Feb. 6, 1778
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/fr-1784.asp
- 1778 – Ratification of the Treaties with France – Debates in Congress; May 2-6
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/fr1778r.asp
- 1778 – Treaty with the Delawares; Sept. 17
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/del1778.asp
- 1783 – The Paris Peace Treaty & Associated Documents
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/parismen.asp
- 1784 – Treaty with the Six Nations, Oct 22
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/six1784.asp
- 1785 – Treaty with the Wyandot, etc.; Jan. 21
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/wya1785.asp
- 1785 – Treaty of Amity & Commerce with his Majesty the King of Prussia; Sept. 10
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/prus1785.asp
- 1785 – Treaty with the Cherokee; Nov. 28
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/chr1785.asp
- 1786 – Treaty with the Chocktaw; Jan. 3
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/choc1786.asp
- 1786 – Treaty with the Chickasaw; Jan 10
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/chic1786.asp
- 1786 – Treaty with the Shawnee; Jan. 31
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/shaw1786.asp

- 1786 – Treaty of Peace and Friendship with Morocco; June 28 & July 15
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/bar1786t.asp
- 1789 – Treaty with the Wyandot, etc.; Jan 9
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/wya1789.asp
- 1789 – Treaty with the Six Nations; Jan 9
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/six1789.asp
- 1790 – Treaty with the Creeks; Aug. 7
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/cre1789m.asp
- 1791 – Treaty with the Cherokee; July 2
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/chr1791.asp
- 1794 – Treaty with the Cherokee; June 26
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/chr1794.asp
- 1794 – Treaty with the Six Nations; Nov. 11
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/six1794.asp
- 1794 – The Jay Treaty; Nov. 19
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/jaymenu.asp
- 1794 – Treaty with the Oneida, etc.; Dec 2
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/one1794.asp
- 1795 – Treaty of Greenville; Aug 3
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/greenvil.asp
- 1795 – Treaty of Peace and Amity with Algeria; Sept. 5
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/bar1795t.asp
- 1795 – Treaty of Friendship, Limits, and Navigation with Spain; Oct. 27
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/sp1795m.asp
- 1796 – Explanatory Article to Article 3 of the Jay Treaty; May 5
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/jayex1.asp
- 1796 – Treaty of Peace and Friendship with Tripoli; Nov. 4
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/bar1796t.asp
- 1797 – Treaty of Peace and Friendship with Tunis; Aug. 28
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/bar1797t.asp

- 1798 – Explanatory Article to Article 5 of the Jay Treaty; March 15
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/jayex2.asp
- 1798 – Declaration of the Commissioners under Article 5 of the Jay Treaty; Oct. 25 http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/jaycomm.asp
- 1802 – Convention Regarding Articles 6 & 7 of the Jay Treaty and Article 4 of the Definitive Treaty of Peace; Jan 8
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/jayconv.asp
- 1803 – Louisiana Purchase Treaty; April 30
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/fr1803m.asp
- 1814 – Treaty of Ghent with Great Britain; Dec 24
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/ghent.asp
- 1815 – Treaty of Peace with Algeria; June 30 & July 3
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/bar1815t.asp
- 1816 – Treaty of Peace and Amity with Algeria; Dec. 22 & 23
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/bar1816.asp
- 1819 – Treaty of Amity, Settlement, and Limits with his Catholic Majesty; Feb. 22 http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/sp1819.asp
- 1824 – Convention of 1824 Amending the Treaty of August 1797 & March 26, 1799 with Tunis; Feb. 24 http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/bar1824t.asp
- 1828 – Treaty with the Potawatami; Sept. 20
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/pot1828.asp
- 1828 – Treaty of Amity, Commerce, and Navigation with Brazil; Dec. 12
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/brazil01.asp
- 1829 – Treaty of Commerce and Navigation with Austria-Hungary; Aug. 27
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/aust01.asp
- 1832 – Treaty with the Potawatami; Oct. 26
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/pot1832.asp
- 1833 – Additional Convention to the Treaty of 1832 with Chile; Sept. 1
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/chile02.asp
- 1836 – Treaty of Peace, Friendship, Navigation and Commerce between the United States and Venezuela; May 31
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/venez_001.asp

- 1836 – Treaty of Peace with Morocco; Sept. 16 (superceded by 1736 Moroccan Treaty) http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/bar1836t.asp
- 1842 – The Webster-Ashburton Treaty & Associated Documents; Aug. 9 http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/br1842m.asp
- 1844 – Texas Treaty of Annexation; April 12 http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/texan05.asp
- 1845 – Treaty of Commerce and Navigation with Belgium; Nov. 10 http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/bel001.asp
- 1845 – Treaty with the Two Sicilies; Dec. 1 http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/sic1845.asp
- 1846 – Treaty with Hanover of Commerce and Navigation; June 10 http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/han1846.asp
- 1846 – Treaty with Great Britain, in regard to limits westward of the Rocky Mountains; June 15 http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/br-1846.asp
- 1847 – Declaration of Accession of his Royal Highness the Grand Duke of Oldenburg, Under the Twelfth Article of the Treaty with Hanover; March 10 http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/old1847.asp
- 1848 – Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo; Feb. 2 http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/guadhida.asp
- 1850 – Clayton-Bulwer Treaty; April 19 http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/br1850.asp
- 1852 – Treaty with the Apache; July 1 http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/apa1852.asp
- 1853 – Treaty with the Comanche, Kiowa, and Apache; July 27 http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/ntreaty/cokiap53.asp
- 1853 – Treaty for the Free Navigation of the Rivers Parana & Uruguay with Argentina; July 10 http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/argen01.asp
- 1853 – Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation with Argentina; July 27 http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/argen02.asp
- 1853 – Treaty with Mexico; Dec. 30 http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/mx1853.asp

- 1854 – Treaty of Kanagawa with Japan; March 31
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/japan002.asp
- 1858 – Treaty of Peace, Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation with Bolivia; May 13 http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/bolivia01.asp
- 1858 – Treaty of Commerce and Navigation with Belgium; June 17
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/bel002.asp
- 1861 – Extradition Treaty with Mexico; Dec. 11
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/mx1861a.asp
- 1862 – Treaty of Commerce and Navigation with the Ottoman Empire; Feb. 25
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/ot1862.asp
- 1862 – Treaty with Great Britain for the Suppression of the Slave Trade; April 7
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/br1862.asp
- 1863 – Additional Article to the Treaty for the Suppression of the African Slave Trade with Great Britain; Feb. 17
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/br1863.asp

1863 April 24 Lieber Code – A Treaty of Peace between the States and US fed govt. should appear in the following list but it doesn't! While moving forward with creating and establishing a treaty of peace to end the Civil War, I believe we ought to accept the following treaties, even though they were performed by the US fed govt.

- 1863 – Treaty for the Final Settlement of the Claims of the Hudson's Bay & Puget's Sound Agricultural Companies with Great Britain; July 1
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/br1864.asp
- 1865 – Treaty with the Cheyenne and Arapaho; Oct. 14
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/char65.asp
- 1865 – Treaty with the Apache, Cheyenne, and Arapaho; Oct. 17
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/apchar65.asp
- 1867 – Russian Treaty, March 30
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/treatywi.asp
- 1867 – Treaty with the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache; Oct. 21
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/kicoap67.asp

- 1868 – Fort Laramie Treaty; April 29
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/ntreaty/nt001.asp
- 1868 – Naturalization Treaty with Bavaria; May 26
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/bav02.asp
- 1875 – Treaty of Commerce and Navigation with Belgium; March 8
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/bel011.asp
- 1898 – Treaty of Peace with Spain; Dec. 10
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/sp1898.asp
- 1900 – Extradition Treaty with Chile; April 17
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/chile07.asp
- 1903 – Convention for the Construction of a Ship Canal (Hay-Bunau-Varila Treaty); Nov. 18 http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/pan001.asp
- 1921 – Treaty between the United States of America, the British Empire, France, and Japan, signed at Washington; Dec. 13
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/tr1921.asp
- 1922 – Treaty between the United States of America, Belgium, the British Empire, China, France, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, and Portugal, signed at Washington; Feb. 6 http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/tr22-01.asp
- 1933 – Anti-war Treaty of non-aggression and Conciliation (Saavedra Lamas Treaty); Oct. 10 http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/intam01.asp
- 1934 – Treaty between the United States of America and Cuba; May 29
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/cuba001.asp
- 1947 – Treaty of Peace with Bulgaria; Feb. 10
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/usmu012.asp
- 1947 – Treaty of Peace with Romania; Feb. 10
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/usmu011.asp
- 1947 – Rio De Janeiro Conference for the Maintenance of Continental Peace and Security (the Rio Treaty); Aug. 15 – Sept. 2
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/decad061.asp
- 1948 – American Treaty on Pacific Settlement (Pact of Bogota); April 30
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/intam09.asp

- 1949 – North Atlantic Treaty; April 4utual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines; Aug. 30
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/nato.asp
- 1951 – Mutual Defense Treaty Between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines; Aug. 30 http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/phil001.asp
- 1951 – Security Treaty between the United States, Australia, and New Zealand (ANZUS); Sept. 1 http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/asmu002.asp
- 1951 – Security Treaty between the United States and Japan; Sept. 8
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/japan001.asp
- 1953 – Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Republic of Korea; Oct. 1954 – Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty (Manila Pact); Sept. 8 http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/kor001.asp
- 1954 – Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Republic of China; Dec. 2 http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/chin001.asp
- 1959 – The Antarctic Treaty; Dec. 1
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/usmu013.asp
- 1967 – Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration & Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon & other Celestial Bodies; Jan. 27
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/usmu016.asp
- 1972 – Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems; May 2
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/sov006.asp

Resources:

- The Lieber Code of 1863:
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/lieber.asp
- Evidence that no treaty of peace has ever been established:
<http://www.nps.gov/apco/faqs.htm>
- Black's Law Dictionary 2nd Edition, 1910:
<http://www.AgainstGovernmentCorruption.org/sites/default/files/Blacks%20Law%20Dictionary%202nd%20Edition-1910.zip>
- ***"The American Constitution"*** by Frederic Jesup Stimson (1908) A “must read!”:
www.AgainstGovernmentCorruption.org/sites/default/files/The_American_constitution.pdf
- Constitution for the united States of America (organic):
<http://www.constitution.org/constit.htm>
- Constitution of the United States of America (fed govt.):
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/usconst.asp
- ***CERTIFIED DOCUMENTATION:*** SENATE RESOLUTION 62, aka Senate Doc 43, of the 73rd Congress, titled “Contracts Payable In Gold,” page 9 (page 11 in the pdf) paragraph 2 states: “The ultimate ownership of all property is the State; individual so-called “ownership” is only by virtue of government i.e., LAW and subordinate to the necessities of the state.”
This ‘article’ talks about debtors having to pay in gold, silver, Treasury Notes, and clearly states that the creditor (the one who is owed payment, regardless of whether they are a bank, man, or woman) cannot demand any one type of re-payment, that the debtor can pay with whatever they want. Download the certified document at
www.AgainstGovernmentCorruption.org/sites/default/files/SenD oc43-Contracts%20Payable%20In%20Gold.pdf

Extra documents for research:

- [Articles of Confederation](http://againstgovernmentcorruption.org/sites/default/files/Articles%20of%20Confederation.pdf)
<http://againstgovernmentcorruption.org/sites/default/files/Articles%20of%20Confederation.pdf>
- [The Federalist Papers](http://againstgovernmentcorruption.org/sites/default/files/Federalist%20Papers.pdf)
<http://againstgovernmentcorruption.org/sites/default/files/Federalist%20Papers.pdf>
- [Letters From an American Farmer](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/letters.asp)
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/letters.asp
- [Wharton's Revolutionary Diplomatic Correspondence Volume 6](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/wharv6.asp)
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/wharv6.asp
- [Native Americans : Treaties with the United States](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/ntreaty.asp)
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/ntreaty.asp
- [Statutes of the United States Concerning Native Americans](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/namenu.asp)
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/namenu.asp
- [Statutes of the United States](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/statutes.asp)
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/statutes.asp
- [Statutes of the United States Concerning Slavery](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/slmenu.asp)
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/slmenu.asp
- [British-American Diplomacy](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/brtreaty.asp)
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/brtreaty.asp
- [Franco-American Diplomacy](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/frtreaty.asp)
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/frtreaty.asp
- [Spanish-American Diplomacy](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/sptreaty.asp)
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/sptreaty.asp
- [Inaugural Addresses of the Presidents of the United States](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/inaug.asp)
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/inaug.asp
- [Papers of Various Presidents of the United States \(Jefferson, Madison, Washington, etc.\)](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/presiden.asp) http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/presiden.asp

